Accelerated Stochastic ADMM for Empirical Risk Minimization

Chao Zhang Hui Qian* Zebang Shen Tengfei Zhou

Computer Science Institute, Zhejiang University
{chaozhang, qianhui, shenzebang, zhoutengfei@zju.edu.cn}

December 1, 2016

arXiv:1611.04074v2 [cs.NA] 30 Nov 2016

Abstract

Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM) is a popular method in solving Machine Learning problems. Stochastic ADMM was firstly proposed in order to reduce the per iteration computational complexity, which is more suitable for big data problems. Recently, variance reduction techniques have been integrated with stochastic ADMM in order to get a fast convergence rate, such as SAG-ADMM and SVRG-ADMM,but the convergence is still suboptimal w.r.t the smoothness constant. In this paper, we propose a new accelerated stochastic ADMM algorithm with variance reduction, which enjoys a faster convergence than all the other stochastic ADMM algorithms. We theoretically analyze its convergence rate and show its dependence on the smoothness constant is optimal. We also empirically validate its effectiveness and show its priority over other stochastic ADMM algorithms.

The Alternating Direction Method of Multipliers (ADMM), firstly proposed by Gabay and Mercier [1976], Glowinski and Marroco [1975], is an efficient and versatile tool, which can always guarantee good performance when handling large-scale data-distributed or big-data related problems, due to its ability of dealing with the objective functions separately and synchronously. Recent studies have shown that ADMM has a convergence rate of $O(1/N)$ (where N is the number of iterations) for general convex problems He and Yuan [2012a,b], Monteiro and Svaiter [2013].

Therefore, ADMM has been widely applied to solve machine learning problems in real world, such as *lasso*, *SVM* Boyd et al. [2011],*group lasso* Meier et al. [2008], *graph guided SVM* Ouyang et al. [2013], and *top ranking* Kadkhodaie et al. [2015]. All these can be easily casted into an Empirical Risk Minimization(ERM) framework. That is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x,y} \quad & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) + g(y) \\ \text{subject to} \quad & Ax + By = z, \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)$ is a loss function, each $f_i(x) : \mathbb{R}^d \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex component, and $g(y) : \mathbb{R}^m \to \mathbb{R}$ is a convex regularizor. For example, given data samples $\{(w_i, b_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ where $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $b_i \in \mathbb{R}$, the group lasso problem can be reformulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{x,y} \quad & \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2}(w_i^T x - b_i)^2 + \nu\|y\|_1 \\ \text{subject to} \quad & Gx = y, \end{aligned}$$

*Corresponding author.

where G is the matrix encoding the group information.

However, in the ERM problem, when the size of the training dataset is large, the minimization procedure in each iteration can be computationally expensive, since it needs to access the whole training set. Many researchers resorted to the increment learning techniques to address such issue. Stochastic ADMM algorithm were proposed Ouyang et al. [2013], Suzuki [2013], Wang and Banerjee [2012], though they only have a suboptimal convergence rate $O(1/\sqrt{N})$. Recently, variance reduction techniques have been integrated with stochastic ADMM in order to get a faster convergence rate, such as SAG-ADMM Zhong and Kwok [2014] and SVRG-ADMM Zheng and Kwok [2016]. They all achieve a $O(1/N)$ convergence rate when $f(x)$ is both convex and smooth, and $g(x)$ is convex.

At the same time, a few researchers tried to accelerate the traditional ADMM method by adding a momentum to the original solvers Goldfarb et al. [2013], Kadkhodaie et al. [2015]. An important work is the AL-ADMM algorithm proposed by Ouyang et al. [2015], which improves the rate of convergence from $O(1/N)$ to $O(1/N^2)$ in terms of its dependence on the smoothness constant L_f of $f(x)$.

Inspired by these two lines of research, we propose an accelerated stochastic ADMM algaorithm called *Accelerated SVRG-ADMM* (ASVRG-ADMM), which incorporates both the variance reduction and the acceleration technique together. By utilizing a set of auxiliary points, we speed up the original SVRG-ADMM algorithm without introducing much extra computation. We theoretically analyze the convergence rate of ASVRG-ADMM and show it is $O(1/N^2)$ for the smoothness constant [1]. Experimental results also show the proposed algorithm outperforms other stochastic ADMM algorithms in the big data settings.

I. Notation and Preliminaries

For a vector x, $\|x\|$ denotes the ℓ_2-norm of x, and $\|x\|_1$ denotes the ℓ_1-norm. For a matrix X, $\|X\|_2$ denotes its spectral norm. For a random variable a, we use $\mathbb{E}(a)$ to denote its expectation and $\mathbb{V}(a) = \mathbb{E}^2(\|a\|) - \mathbb{E}(\|a\|^2)$ to denote its variance. For a function $h(x)$, we denote its gradient and subgradient as ∇h and $\partial h(x)$ respectively. A function $h(x)$ is L-smooth if it is differentiable and $\|h'(x) - h'(y)\| \leq L\|x - y\|$, or equivalently,

$$h(x) \leq h(y) + \langle \nabla h(y), x - y\rangle + \frac{L}{2}\|x - y\|^2.$$

We call L the *smoothness constant*.

For the convenience of notation, we denote $f(x) = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x)$, $u = (x, y)$, and $w = (x, y, \lambda)$. We assume that the effective domain $\mathcal{X}$ of x and $\mathcal{Y}$ of y are bounded, that is

$$\begin{aligned} D_{x^*} &= \sup_{x\in\mathcal{X}} \|x - x^*\|, \\ D_{y^*,B} &= \sup_{y\in\mathcal{Y}} \|B(y - y_*)\|, \text{and} \\ D_{X,A} &= \sup_{x_a,x_b\in\mathcal{X}} \|A(x_a - x_b)\| \end{aligned}$$

exists and not equal to infinity, where A and B are matrices in the constraint of (1). We also assume that the optimal solution $u^* = (x^*, y^*)$ of problem (1) and the optimal of each f_i exists.

Similar to those in Ouyang et al. [2015], we denote the gap function as follows.

[1] The overall convergence is $O(\frac{aL_f}{N^2} + \frac{b}{N})$, where aL_f will dominate b in most ERM problems, since big dataset means big smoothness constant.

Definition (Gap Function). *For any* $w = (x, y, \lambda)$ *and* $\bar{w} = (\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda})$, *we define*

$$\begin{aligned} Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda}; x, y, \lambda) = &[f(x) + g(y) + \langle \bar{\lambda}, Ax + By - c\rangle] \\ &- [f(\bar{x}) + g(\bar{y}) + \langle \lambda, A\bar{x} + B\bar{y} - c\rangle]. \end{aligned}$$

For the simplicity of notation, we also write $Q(\bar{w}; w) = Q(\bar{x}, \bar{y}, \bar{\lambda}; x, y, \lambda)$.

II. Related Work

Here we focus on the constraint optimization problem

$$\min_{x,y} f(x) + g(y), \quad \text{s.t.} \quad Ax + By = z, \tag{2}$$

where $f(x)$ is both convex and L_f-smooth, and $g(y)$ is convex. Besides, we also assume that each f_i is L_i- smooth.

To solve problem (2), ADMM starts with the augmented Lagrangian of the original problem:

$$\begin{aligned} L_\beta(x, y, \lambda) := &f(x) + g(y) - \langle \lambda, Ax + By - z\rangle \\ &+ \frac{\beta}{2}\|Ax + By - z\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

where $\beta > 0$ is a constant, and λ is the vector of Lagrangian multipliers. In each round, ADMM minimizes L_β with respect to the variables x and y alternatively given the other fixed, followed by an update of the vector λ. Specifically, it updates x, y and λ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} x_t &= \text{argmin} L_\beta(x, y_{t-1}, \lambda_{t-1}), \\ y_t &= \text{argmin} L_\beta(x_t, y, \lambda_{t-1}), \\ \lambda_t &= \lambda_t - \beta(Ax_t + By_t - c). \end{aligned}$$

In order to avoid the access to the whole dataset in the x update and further reduce the per-iteration computation complexity, stochastic ADMM algorithm(SADMM) was proposed by Ouyang et al. [2013]. However, their method can only achieve a suboptimal convergence rate $O(\frac{L_f D_{x^*}^2}{N} + \frac{c}{N} + \frac{D_{x^*}\sigma}{\sqrt{N}})$, where c is a constant that depends on $D_{x^*}, D_{y^*,B}$ and $D_{X,A}$, and σ is the upper bound of the variance of stochastic gradients. Typically, σ and $L_f D_{x^*}^2$ can be rather large and c is small compared to them. Based on Ouyang et al. [2013], Azadi and Sra [2014] proposed an accelerated stochastic ADMM algorithm(ASADMM) to reduce the dependence of L_f, which has a $O(\frac{L_f D_{x^*}^2}{N^2} + \frac{c}{N} + \frac{D_{x^*}\sigma}{\sqrt{N}})$ convergence rate. The $O(\frac{L_f D_{x^*}^2}{N^2})$ is optimal w.r.t. the smoothness constant L_f, but due to the high variance of stochastic gradients, their method is far away from optimal.

Borrowed idea from variance reduction techniques used in stochastic gradient descent literature, SAG-ADMM Zhong and Kwok [2014] and SVRG-ADMM Zheng and Kwok [2016] are recently proposed. These methods enjoy similar convergence rate $O(\frac{L_f D_{x^*}^2}{N} + \frac{c_1}{N})$, where c_1 is a constant which depends on D_{x^*}, D_{y^*} , $D_{X,A}$,$\|A\|_2$ and $\|B\|_2$, and can be rather small compared to $L_f D_{x^*}^2$ (different algorithms may have different c_1).

Recently, acceleration technique has been integrated with variance reduction in stochastic gradient descent literature Allen-Zhu [2016], Hien et al. [2016], which improves the convergence rate from $O(1/N)$ to $O(1/N^2)$, but it is still not clear how to combine this two techniques in stochastic ADMM literature to get a more effective method.

III. ASVRG-ADMM Algorithm

In this section, we first propose an general ASVRG-ADMM framework for solving (2), and then analyze relation between the convergence rate and the parameter settings. Finally, we conclude our Accelerated SVRG-ADMM algorithm by specifying the particular parameter setting. The proposed framework is presented in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1: ASVRG-ADMM Framework

1 Initialization : $\tilde{x}_0 = x_{m,0}, \tilde{y}_0 = y_{m,0}, \tilde{\lambda}_0 = \lambda_{m,0}$ such that $A\tilde{x}_0 + B\tilde{y}_0 - c = 0$
2 **for** $s = 1, 2 \cdots N$ **do**
3 Update $\alpha_{1,s}, \alpha_{2,s}, \alpha_{3,s}, \theta_s$ and ρ_s;
4 $x_{0,s} = x_{m,s-1}$; $y_{0,s} = y_{m,s-1}$; $\lambda_{0,s} = \lambda_{m,s-1}$;
5 $x^{ag}_{0,s} = x^{ag}_{m,s-1}$; $y^{ag}_{0,s} = y^{ag}_{m,s-1}$; $\lambda^{ag}_{0,s} = \lambda^{ag}_{m,s-1}$;
6 $\tilde{v}_s = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} \nabla f_i(\tilde{x}_{s-1})$;
7 **for** $t = 1, 2, \cdots, m$ **do**
8 $x^{md}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s} x^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1}$;
9 Sample i_t uniformly from $\{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$;
10 $v_{t,s} = \nabla f_{i_t}(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) + \tilde{v}_s$;
11 $x_{t,s} = \mathrm{argmin}_x \bar{L}_{t,s}(x, y_{t-1,s}, \lambda_{t-1,s}, \chi)$;
12 $x^{ag}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s} x^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{t,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1}$;
13 $y_{t,s} = \mathrm{argmin}_y g(y) + \langle \lambda_{t-1,s}, Ax_{t,s} + By - c\rangle + \frac{\theta_s}{2}\|Ax_{t,s} + By - c\|^2$;
14 $y^{ag}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s} y^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} y_{t,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{y}_{s-1}$;
15 $\lambda_{t,s} = \lambda_{t-1,s} + \rho_s(Ax_{t,s} + By_{t,s} - c)$;
16 $\lambda^{ag}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s}\lambda^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s}\lambda_{t,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{\lambda}_{s-1}$;
17 **end**
18 $\tilde{x}_s = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{t=1}^{m} x^{ag}_{t,s}$; $\tilde{y}_s = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{t=1}^{m} y^{ag}_{t,s}$;
19 $\tilde{\lambda}_s = \frac{1}{m}\sum_{t=1}^{m} \lambda^{ag}_{t,s}$;
20 **end**

Output: $\hat{w}_N = \frac{1}{1+\alpha_{3,N+1}m} w^{ag}_{m,N} + \frac{\alpha_{3,N+1}m}{1+\alpha_{3,N+1}m}\tilde{w}_N$

In this framework, the updates of x and y are actually alternatingly minimizing the weighted linearized augmented Lagrangian:

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{L}_{t,s}(x, y, \lambda_{t,s}, \chi) = f(x_{t-1,s}) &\\ + \langle v_{t,s}, x\rangle + g(y) + \langle \lambda_{t-1,s}, Ax + By - c\rangle &\\ + \chi\theta_s\langle Ax, Ax_{t-1,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c\rangle &\\ + \frac{(1-\chi)\theta_s}{2}\|Ax + By_{t-1,s} - c\|^2 &\\ + \frac{\eta_s}{2}\|x - x_{t-1,s}\|^2,&\end{aligned}$$

where $f(x)$ in the original augmented lagrangian $L_\beta(x, y, \lambda)$ is linearized as $f(x_{t-1,s}) + \langle v_{t,s}, x\rangle + \frac{\eta_s}{2}\|x - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2$ and a weight parameter θ_s is added to the constraint measure $\frac{\|Ax+By-c\|_2^2}{2}$. However, we must notice that $v_{t,s}$ is an unbiased estimation of $\nabla f(x^{md}_{t,s})$ instead of $\nabla f(x_{t,s})$. Here,χ is an indicator variable that is either 0 or 1. If $\chi = 0$, augmented term $\|Ax + By_{t-1,s} - c\|^2$ is preserved , and the update in line (10) of Algorithm 1 is

$$x_{t,s} = (\eta_s I + \theta_s A^T A)^{-1}(\eta_s x_{t-1,s} - v_{t,s} - A^T\lambda_{t-1,s} - \theta_s A^T(By_{t-1,s} - c)). \quad (3)$$

Since every update in (3) involves a matrix inverse, which can be quite complicated when A is large, we can set $\chi = 1$ to linearize this part to simplify the computation. When $\chi = 1$, the augmented term $\|Ax+By-c\|^2$ in $\bar{L}_{t,s}(x, y, \lambda_{t,s})$ is linearized as $\langle Ax_{t-1,s}+By_{t-1,s}-c, Ax\rangle$ in the t-th iteration, and the update in line (10) of Algorithm 1 is simplified as

$$x_{t,s} = x_{t-1,s} - \frac{1}{\eta_s}(A^T\lambda_{t-1.s} + v_{t,s} + \theta_s A^T(Ax_{t-1,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c)). \quad (4)$$

Similar to other accelerated methods, we construct a set of auxiliary sequences $\{x^{md}\}$, $\{x^{ag}\}$,$\{y^{ag}\}$ and $\{\lambda^{ag}\}$. Here the superscript "ag" stands for "aggregate", and "md" stand for "middle". We can see that all $\{x^{md}_{t,s}\}$ and $\{x^{ag}_{t,s}\}$ are actually weighted sums of all the previous $\{x_{i,k}\}$ and all $\{y^{ag}_{t,s}\}$ and $\{\lambda^{ag}_{t,s}\}$ are weighted sums of previous $\{y_{i,k}\}$ and $\{\lambda_{i,k}\}$,respectively. We require all the weight parameters $\alpha_{1,s}, \alpha_{2,s}, \alpha_{3,s}$ belong to $(0, 1)$ and their sum equals 1 to make all the auxiliary points to be a convex combination of three previous point. If the wights $\alpha_{2,s} = 1$ for all s, then $x^{md}_{t,s} = x_{t-1,s}$, and the aggregate points $x^{ag}_{t,s} = x_{t,s}$, $y^{ag}_{t,s} = y_{t,s}$ and $\lambda^{ag}_{t,s} = \lambda_{t,s}$. In this situation, if we set all $\theta_s = \rho_s = \beta$, the ASVRG-ADMM becomes SVRG-ADMM. However, with carefully chosen parameters we can significantly improve the rate of convergence.

III.1 Convergence Analysis

In this subsection, we will give the convergence analysis of the proposed framework, and conclude our ASVRG-ADMM algorithm.

Before we address the main theorem on the convergence rate, we will firstly try to bound the variance of the stochastic gradient. In order to control the variance of the stochastic gradient, we first take a snapshot $\tilde{x}_{s-1}$ at the beginning of each outer iteration and calculate its full gradient $\tilde{v}_s$, and then randomly sample one $f_{i_t}(x)$ and update $v_{t,s} = \nabla f_{i_t}(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) + \tilde{v}_s$ in each inner loop. Similar to Allen-Zhu [2016] and Hien et al. [2016], we use a different upper bound from the analysis of SVRG-ADMM.

Lemma 1. *In each of the inner iteration,the variance of $v_{t,s}$ is bounded by*

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}\|v_{t,s} - \nabla f(x^{md}_{t,s})\|_2^2 &\leq 2L_Q(f(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) - f(x^{md}_{t,s}) \\ &- \langle \nabla f(x^{md}_{t-1,s}), \tilde{x}_{s-1} - x^{md}_{t,s}\rangle),\end{aligned}$$

where $L_Q = max_i\{L_i\}$.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathbb{E}\|v_{t,s} - \nabla f(x^{md}_{t,s})\|_2^2 \\ &= \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f_{i_t}(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) + \nabla f(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) - \nabla f(x^{md}_{t,s})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \mathbb{E}\|\nabla f_{i_t}(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \nabla f_{i_t}(\tilde{x}_{s-1})\|_2^2 \\ &\leq \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} 2L_i(f_i(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) - f_i(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \langle \nabla f_i(x^{md}_{t,s}), \tilde{x}_{s-1} - x^{md}_{t,s}\rangle) \\ &\leq 2L_Q(f(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) - f(x^{md}_{t,s}) - \langle \nabla f(x^{md}_{t-1,s}), \tilde{x}_{s-1} - x^{md}_{t,s}\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

The first equality is according to the definition of $v_{t,s}$. In the first inequality,we use $\mathbb{E}\|a-\mathbb{E}(a)\|_2^2 \leq \mathbb{E}\|a\|_2^2$. The second inequality is because of the smoothness of each $f_i(x)$, and the last one is just due to the definition of L_Q. □

Utilizing the above lemma, we are able to obtain an upper bound of the progress of the gap funciton Q in each inner loop.

Lemma 2. *In Algorithm 1, if we choose $\theta_s \geq \rho_s$ and $\eta_s \geq \bar{L}_s\alpha_{2,s} + \chi\theta_s\|A\|_2^2$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag}) &- \alpha_{1,s}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) \\
&- \alpha_{3,s}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
&\leq \alpha_{2,s,t}[\frac{\eta_s}{2}(\|x_{t,s} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t,s} - x^*\|^2) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2\rho_s}(\|\lambda_{t-1,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+ \frac{\chi\theta_s}{2}\|A(x_{t,s} - x^*)\|^2 \\
&- \frac{\chi\theta_s}{2}\|A(x_{t-1,s} - x^*)\|^2 \\
&+ \frac{\theta_s}{2}\|Ax^* + By_{t-1,s} - c\|^2 \\
&- \frac{\theta_s}{2}\|Ax^* + By_{t,s} - c\|^2],
\end{aligned}$$

where $\bar{L}_s \geq L_Q/\alpha_{3,s} + L_f$ and the expectation is w.r.t $v_{t,s}$.

The proof of this inequality is lengthy and tedious, so we leave it in the supplement. We can see that this bound is not only related to $x_{t,s}$ and $x_{t-1,s}$, but also related to $\tilde{x}_{s-1}$. It is very common in snapshot based algorithms. Lemma 2 proves crucial for doing the induction to obtain the next step towards our final conclusion.

Lemma 3. *If in the $(s+1)$-th outer iteration, we choose $\frac{1-\alpha_{2,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2} = \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}$ and $\frac{\alpha_{3,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2} = \frac{1-\alpha_{1,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}$,and make $\theta_s = \beta_1\alpha_{2,s}$, $\rho_s = \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_{2,s}}$,$\eta_s = (\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2)\alpha_{2,s}$. Then in the N-th iteration, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{x}_N) + g(\hat{y}_N) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \gamma\|A\hat{x}_N + B\hat{y}_N - c\|^2] \\
&\leq \frac{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}{1 + m\alpha_{3,N+1}}[\frac{1 + m\alpha_{3,1}}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) \\
&+ \frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}D_{x^*}^2 + \frac{1}{2\beta_2}\gamma^2 + \frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}D_{A,X}^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{2}D_{y^*,B}^2],
\end{aligned}$$

here we need choose β_1 and β_2 to satisfy $\theta_s \geq \rho_s$, and $\bar{L} \geq \max_s\{L_Q/\alpha_{3,s} + L_f\}$.

Before we conclude our main theorem of the convergence rate of ASVRG-ADMM, we need to have a look at all the parameter constraints in Lemma 3.

$$\begin{cases}
\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2} = \frac{1-\alpha_{2,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}, \frac{1-\alpha_{1,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}} = \frac{\alpha_{3,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}; \\
\alpha_{1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} + \alpha_{3,s} = 1 \\
\theta_{t,s} = \beta_1\alpha_{2,s}, \rho_{t,s} = \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_{2,s}}, \theta_s \geq \rho_s; \\
\eta_{t,s} = \bar{L}\alpha_{2,s} + \chi\|A\|_2^2\theta_s, \quad \bar{L} \geq \max_s\{L_Q/\alpha_{3,s} + L_f\}.
\end{cases}$$

To satisfy the constraints on weight parameters $\alpha_{1,s}, \alpha_{2,s}, \alpha_{3,s}$, we can actually calculate the update rule of each

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha_{1,s+1} &= \alpha_{1,s} * (1 - \alpha_{2,s+1}), \\
\alpha_{2,s+1} &= \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_{2,s}^4 + 4\alpha_{2,s}^2} - \alpha_{2,s}^2}{2}, \\
\alpha_{3,s+1} &= (1 - \alpha_{1,s}) * (1 - \alpha_{2,s+1}).
\end{aligned}$$

The following lemma depicts the property of this sequence.

Lemma 4. *If $\alpha_{1,s} \in (0,1), \alpha_{2,s} \in (0, \frac{2}{2+s}], \alpha_{3,s} \in (0,1)$, and their sum equals to 1, then $\alpha_{1,s+1} \in (0, \alpha_{1,s})$, $\alpha_{2,s+1} \in (0, \min\{\alpha_{2,s}, \frac{2}{s+3}\})$, $\alpha_{3,s+1} \in (\alpha_{3,s}, 1)$ and their sum equals to 1,too.*

Proof. Denote $h(a) = \frac{\sqrt{a^4+4a^2}-a^2}{2}$ as a function of a, we have $\nabla h(a) > 0$ for $a \in (0,1)$. Then $\alpha_{1,s+1} \leq h(\frac{2}{s+2})$. Since $h(\frac{2}{s+2}) < \frac{2}{s+3}$, then $\alpha_{1,s+1} < \frac{2}{s+3}$. Besides, it is easy to verify $\alpha_{2,s+1} - \alpha_{2,s} \leq 0$ and $0 < \alpha_{2,s+1} < 1$. then we have $\alpha_{2,s+1} \in (0, \min\{\alpha_{2,s}, \frac{2}{s+3}\})$. Since $\alpha_{1,s+1} = \alpha_{1,s} * (1 - \alpha_{2,s+1})$, then $\alpha_{1,s+1} \in (0, \alpha_{1,s})$. As $\alpha_{3,s+1} - \alpha_{3,s} = \alpha_{1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} - \alpha_{1,s+1} - \alpha_{2,s+1}$, then $\alpha_{3,s+1} \in (\alpha_{3,s}, 1)$. □

This means $\{\alpha_{1,s}\}$ and $\{\alpha_{2,s}\}$ are decreasing and $\{\alpha_{3,s}\}$ is increasing. Besides, we also have all $\alpha_{2,s} \leq \frac{2}{s+2}$ if $\alpha_{2,1} \leq \frac{2}{3}$. Actually, we can verify that if $\alpha_{2,1} = 2/3$, then $\alpha_{2,s} \to \frac{2}{2+s}$ as $s \to \infty$, and $\beta_1 = N$, $\beta_2 = \frac{1}{N}$ will ensure $\theta_s \geq 1 \geq \rho_s$. Since $\alpha_{3,s}$ is increasing, $\bar{L} \geq L_Q/\alpha_{3,1} + L_f$ will satisfy the constraint. Based on all these, we are now ready to present our main theorem of convergence rate:

Theorem 1. *If we initialize $\alpha_{2,1} = \frac{2}{3}$, $\alpha_{3,1} \in (0, \frac{1}{3})$, $\alpha_{1,1} = 1 - \alpha_{2,1} - \alpha_{3,1}$, then with proper parameter setting the same as in lemma 3 and $\beta_1 = N$, $\beta_2 = \frac{1}{N}$, $\bar{L} = L_Q/\alpha_{3,1} + L_f$, we have*

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{x}_N) + g(\hat{y}_N) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \gamma\|A\hat{x}_N + B\hat{y}_N - c\|^2] \\
&= \mathrm{O}\big(\frac{1}{N^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) + \frac{L_Q + L_f}{mN^2} D_{x^*}^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{mN}[\frac{\chi\|A\|_2^2}{2} D_{x^*}^2 + \gamma^2 + \chi D_{A,X}^2 + D_{y^*,B}^2]\big).
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. Since $\alpha_{2,N+1} \leq \frac{2}{N+3}$ and $\frac{1}{1+m\alpha_{3,N+1}} \leq \frac{1}{1+m\alpha_{3,1}}$, then according to 3, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&f(\hat{x}_N) + g(\hat{y}_N) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \gamma\|A\hat{x}_N + B\hat{y}_N - c\|^2 \\
&\leq \frac{4}{\alpha_{2,1}^2(N+3)^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) \\
&+ \frac{N}{2m(N+3)^2}[\chi\|A\|_2^2 D_{x^*}^2 + \gamma^2 + \chi D_{A,X}^2 + D_{y^*,B}^2] \\
&+ \frac{2(L_Q/\alpha_{3,1} + L_f)}{(N+3)^2(1 + m\alpha_{3,1})} D_{x^*}^2 \\
&= \mathrm{O}\big(\frac{1}{N^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) + \frac{L_Q + L_f}{mN^2} D_{x^*}^2 \\
&+ \frac{1}{mN}[\chi\|A\|_2^2 D_{x^*}^2 + \gamma^2 + \chi D_{A,X}^2 + D_{y^*,B}^2]\big).
\end{aligned}$$

□

The convergence result in **Theorem 1** mainly consists of the convergence of three parts:

- $f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)$: This part measures the influence of the initial objective value on the convergence rate. Actually in most ERM problems such as (group/fused) lasso, l_1/l_2 penalized regresion/logistic regression, $f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)$ can be quite small if we simply initialized $\tilde{x}_0 = 0$ and $\tilde{y}_0 = 0$. For example, in two label classification, for any commonly used regularizer $g(y)(l_1/l_2$ norm;group/fussed lasso penalty), if $f(x)$ is the logistic loss then $f(0)+g(0) = In(2)$; if $f(x)$ is the square loss then $f(0)+g(0) = \frac{1}{2}$. Since $f(x_*)+g(y_*)$ here must be great than 0, then this part can be really small compared to the other two parts.

- $(L_Q + L_f)D^2_{x^*}$: This is the dominant part of the convergence since L_Q and L_f can be rather large for ERM problems with a big dataset, and we assume $L_Q = O(L_f)$ without lost of generality.

- $\chi\|A\|_2^2 D^2_{x^*} + \gamma^2 + \chi D^2_{A,X} + D^2_{y^*,B}$: Here D_{x^*}, $D_{A,X}$, $D_{y^*,B}$ are constant denoting the boundary of the effective domain of x and y.They are always assumed to be finite in the analysis of stochastic ADMM algorithms and are typically small compared to $(L_Q + L_f)D^2_{x^*}$. It also shows the linearization of $\|Ax + By - c\|^2$ ($\chi = 1$) will not effect the convergence significantly.

Thus if we make the count of iter loop as $m = n$, then the convergence rate of ASVRG-ADMM can be written as $O(\frac{L_f D_X^2}{nN^2} + \frac{c_3}{N^2} + \frac{c_2}{nN})$, where c_2 and c_3 are rather small compared to $L_f D_X^2$. If we use similar notation,the convergence rate of SAG-ADMM is $O(\frac{L_f D_X^2}{N} + \frac{c_4}{nN})$ and the convergence rate of SVRG-ADMM is $O(\frac{L_f D_X^2}{nN} + \frac{c_5}{N} + \frac{c_6}{nN})$, where c_4, c_5, c_6 are all small compared to $L_f D_X^2$ in most of the ERM problems. Typically, c_3, c_5 are of the same order, c_2, c_4, c_6 are of the same order and c_3, c_5 are much smaller than c_2, c_4, c_6. It is clear from the above analysis that our proposed accelerated stochastic ADMM algorithm(ASVRG-ADMM) are much better than other stochastic variance reduction ADMM without acceleration in dealing with ERM problem. Moreover, when the dataset is large and $f(x)$ has a large smoothness constant, the second part will dominant the convergence and the convergence rate will be optimal $O(1/N^2)$ w.r.t. the smoothness constant, while other methods only achieve $O(1/N)$ convergence. As for the vanilla stochastic ADMM algorithms without variance reduction SADMM Ouyang et al. [2013] and ASADMM Azadi and Sra [2014], both of their analyses include the variance of the stochastic gradient σ explicitly, and the convergence rate is $O(\frac{\sigma D_X}{\sqrt{nN}})$ w.r.t. σ, which is uncontrollable and can be extremely bad in practice.

III.2 Discussion on the parameters

Let's have a deeper insight into the parameters in the ASVRG-ADMM algorithm. The weight parameters $\alpha_{1,s}, \alpha_{2,s}\alpha_{3,s}$ are updated once in each out iteration, and stay the same in the inner loop. In each inner loop, the update of $x^{md}_{t,s}$ and $x^{ag}_{t,s}$ are:

$$x^{md}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s} x^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1};$$

$$x^{ag}_{t,s} = \alpha_{1,s} x^{ag}_{t-1,s} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{t,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1}.$$

It seems that both $x^{md}_{t,s}$ and $x^{ag}_{t,s}$ are somehow trapped at $\tilde{x}^{s-1}$, and we even gradually increase the weight on $\tilde{x}_{s-1}$. However, it is not incomprehensible since we are actually analyze the convergence of sequences $\{\tilde{x}_s\}$ (since $\alpha_{3,N+1}m >> 1$, $\bar{w}_s \approx \tilde{w}_s$). According to line 18 in Algorithm 1

$$\tilde{x}_s = \frac{\alpha_{1,s}}{m}\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} x^{ag}_{i,s} + \frac{\alpha_{2,s}}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m} x_{i,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1},$$

Table 1: A summary of the datasets.

Dataset	w8a	ijcnn1	a9a	covtype
#Instance	49,749	49,990	32,561	581012
#Attribute	300	22	123	54
$\#L_f$	2.6448	0.2305	6.2877	$2.0164 * 10^7$

and it is updated after we use one full gradient and n stochastic gradient. While in the deterministic accelerated ADMM algorithm proposed by Ouyang et al. [2015], the update of the auxiliary points are

$$x_s^{md} = \alpha_{1,s} x_{s-1}^{ag} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{s-1}; \quad x_s^{ag} = \alpha_{1,s} x_{s-1}^{ag} + \alpha_{2,s} x_s.$$

Here x_s is updated based on the full gradient, and $\alpha_{2,s}$ is decreased similar to $\alpha_{2,s}$ in our algorithm. Since x_s^{ag} is updated based an one full gradient and the convergence of their algorithm is w.r.t. x_s^{ag}, x_s^{ag} here is similar to $\tilde{x}_s$ instead of $x_{t,s}^{ag}$ in our ASVRG-ADMM algorithm. As the weight of previous x_{s-1}^{ag} is also gradually increased, it is not counterintuitive for us to gradually increase the weight of $\tilde{x}_{s-1}$. Actually, when $m = 1$, ASVRG-ADMM is actually the same as the deterministic accelerated ADMM method proposed by Ouyang et al. [2015].



(a) a9a (b) w8a (c) ijcnn1

(d) covertype

Figure 1: Performance over effective passes of data for convex f

Besides, we have to mention that the parameter update rules we use here are different from all other accelerated stochastic methods with similar procedure Allen-Zhu [2016], Hien et al. [2016], where they fix the weight parameter α_3 of $\tilde{x}_{s-1}$ to be a constant, and only change $\alpha_{1,s}$ and $\alpha_{2,s}$.

Since $\eta_s = \bar{L}\alpha_{2,s} + \chi\|A\|_2^2\theta_s$ and $\theta_s = \beta_1\alpha_{2,s}$, the matrix inverse in x update rule (3) is

$$(\eta_s I + \theta_s A^T A)^{-1} = \alpha_{2,s}^{-1}(\bar{L}I + \beta_1 A^T A)^{-1}.$$

Then we can pre-compute $(\bar{L}I + \beta_1 A^T A)^{-1}$ and store it in order the decrease the computation. According to the update rules of θ_s, η_s, ρ_s, we gradually decrease θ_s and η_s, and increase ρ_s. This means we increases the step size of the x-update and the λ-update.

IV. Experimental Results

In this section, we give the experimental results of the proposed algorithm. We consider the generalized lasso Tibshirani [2011]. More specifically, we solve the following optimization problem:

$$\min_{x,y} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) + \nu\|Fx\|_1,$$

where the penalty matrix F gives information about the underlying sparsity pattern of x. While proximal methods have been used to solve this problem (Liu et al. [2010], Barbero and Sra [2011]), the existence of F makes the underlying proximal step difficult to solve. This problem can be rewritten as

$$\min_{x,y} \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i(x) + \nu\|y\|_1, \quad s.t. \quad Fx - y = 0.$$

It can be solved efficiently by ADMM methods by dealing with x and y separately. In our experiments, we focus on the graph guided fused lasso Kim et al. [2009], where $F = [G; I]$ is constructed based on a graph and G denotes the sparsity pattern of graph. We use SVRG-ADMMZheng and Kwok [2016] and SAG-ADMM Zhong and Kwok [2014] as our baseline. Since we can linearize $\|Fx - y\|_2^2$ in the augmented lagrangian in all these three method , here in our implementation we use this technique to reduce the computation complexity.

We conduct experiments on four real-world datasets from web machine learning repositories. All the datasets were downloaded from the LIBSVM website, and their basic information are listed in Table 1. We repeat all the experiments for 10 times and report the average results. For the parameters in ASVRG-ADMM, we initialize $\alpha_{2,1} = 2/3$, $\alpha_{3,1} = 1/10$, and all other parameters are set as in Theorem 1. For parameters in SAG-ADMM and SVRG-ADMM, we all choose them as indicated in their papers, and SAG-ADMM is initialized by running SADMM for n iteration. All the methods are implemented in Matlab, and all the experiments are performed on a Windows server with two Intel Xeon E5-2690 CPU and 128GB memory.

If the algorithm uses one full gradient or n stochastic gradients, we call it uses one effective pass of data. We report the objective value over effective passes of data. We can see that in all the four datasets, our ASVRG-ADMM algorithm outperforms the other two algorithms. On the first three data set, the smoothness constant is small and all the three method converges after 20 effective passes of data, the ASVRG-ADMM method converges faster then the other two algorithms. When L_f is large(on the covtype dataset), all the three algorithms do not converge in 50 passes of data, but the objective of ASVRG-ADMM decreases much faster than the other two algorithms.

V. Conclusion

In this paper, we combine the variance reduction technique and the acceleration technique in stochastic ADMM together, we devised a new stochastic method with faster convergence rate, especially in term of the smoothness constant of $f(x)$. It is of great significance since big dataset often means a large smoothness constant. Our experimental results also validate the effectiveness of our algorithm. *Bibliography

Zeyuan Allen-Zhu. Katyusha: Accelerated variance reduction for faster sgd. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1603.05953*, 2016.

Samaneh Azadi and Suvrit Sra. Towards an optimal stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 620–628, 2014.

Alvaro Barbero and Suvrit Sra. Fast newton-type methods for total variation regularization. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-11)*, pages 313–320, 2011.

Stephen Boyd, Neal Parikh, Eric Chu, Borja Peleato, and Jonathan Eckstein. Distributed optimization and statistical learning via the alternating direction method of multipliers. *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 3(1):1–122, 2011.

Daniel Gabay and Bertrand Mercier. A dual algorithm for the solution of nonlinear variational problems via finite element approximation. *Computers & Mathematics with Applications*, 2(1): 17–40, 1976.

Roland Glowinski and A Marroco. Sur l'approximation, par éléments finis d'ordre un, et la résolution, par pénalisation-dualité d'une classe de problèmes de dirichlet non linéaires. *Revue française d'automatique, informatique, recherche opérationnelle. Analyse numérique*, 9(2): 41–76, 1975.

Donald Goldfarb, Shiqian Ma, and Katya Scheinberg. Fast alternating linearization methods for minimizing the sum of two convex functions. *Mathematical Programming*, 141(1-2):349–382, 2013.

Bingsheng He and Xiaoming Yuan. On the o(1/n) convergence rate of the douglas-rachford alternating direction method. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 50(2):700–709, 2012a.

Bingsheng He and Xiaoming Yuan. On non-ergodic convergence rate of douglas–rachford alternating direction method of multipliers. *Numerische Mathematik*, 130(3):567–577, 2012b.

Le Thi Khanh Hien, Canyi Lu, Huan Xu, and Jiashi Feng. Accelerated stochastic mirror descent algorithms for composite non-strongly convex optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1605.06892*, 2016.

Mojtaba Kadkhodaie, Konstantina Christakopoulou, Maziar Sanjabi, and Arindam Banerjee. Accelerated alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Proceedings of the 21th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 497–506. ACM, 2015.

Seyoung Kim, Kyung-Ah Sohn, and Eric P Xing. A multivariate regression approach to association analysis of a quantitative trait network. *Bioinformatics*, 25(12):i204–i212, 2009.

Jun Liu, Lei Yuan, and Jieping Ye. An efficient algorithm for a class of fused lasso problems. In *Proceedings of the 16th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 323–332. ACM, 2010.

Lukas Meier, Sara Van De Geer, and Peter Bühlmann. The group lasso for logistic regression. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 70(1):53–71, 2008.

Renato DC Monteiro and Benar F Svaiter. Iteration-complexity of block-decomposition algorithms and the alternating direction method of multipliers. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 23(1):475–507, 2013.

Hua Ouyang, Niao He, Long Tran, and Alexander Gray. Stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 80–88, 2013.

Yuyuan Ouyang, Yunmei Chen, Guanghui Lan, and Eduardo Pasiliao Jr. An accelerated linearized alternating direction method of multipliers. *SIAM Journal on Imaging Sciences*, 8(1):644–681, 2015.

Taiji Suzuki. Dual averaging and proximal gradient descent for online alternating direction multiplier method. In *Proceedings of the 30th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-13)*, pages 392–400, 2013.

Ryan Joseph Tibshirani. *The solution path of the generalized lasso*. Stanford University, 2011.

Huahua Wang and Arindam Banerjee. Online alternating direction method. In *Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-12)*, pages 1119–1126, 2012.

Shuai Zheng and James T Kwok. Fast-and-light stochastic admm. In *The 25th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-16), New York City, NY, USA*, 2016.

Wenliang Zhong and James Kwok. Fast stochastic alternating direction method of multipliers. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-14)*, pages 46–54, 2014.

VI. Appendix

VI.1 Proof of Lemma 2

Proof. By the smoothness of $f(\cdot)$, we have

$$f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) \leq f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}), x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle + \frac{L_f}{2}\|x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md}\|_2^2.$$

According to line 7 and line 11 in Algorithm 1, we have $x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} = \alpha_{2,s}(x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s})$. Substituting this into the above inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) &\leq f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}), x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle + \frac{L_f \alpha_{2,s}^2}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2. \\
&\leq f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}) - v_{t,s}, x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle + \frac{L_f \alpha_{2,s}^2}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 + \langle v_{t,s}, x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle \\
&\leq f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,s}}{2L_Q}\|\nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}) - v_{t,s}\|_2^2 + \frac{L_Q}{2\alpha_{3,s}}\|x_{t,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md}\|_2^2 + \frac{L_f \alpha_{2,s}^2}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 \\
&\quad + \langle v_{t,s}, \alpha_{1,s} x_{t-1,s}^{ag} + \alpha_{2,s} x_{t,s} + \alpha_{3,s}\tilde{x}_{s-1} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle \\
&\leq \alpha_{1,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle v_{t,s}, x_{t-1,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle) + \alpha_{2,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle v_{t,s}, x - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle) \\
&\quad + \alpha_{3,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle v_{t,s}, \tilde{x}_{s-1} - x_{t,s}^{md} \rangle + \frac{1}{2L_Q}\|\nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}) - v_{t,s}\|^2) \\
&\quad \alpha_{2,s}\langle v_{t,s}, x_{t,s} - x \rangle + \frac{\alpha_{2,s}^2(L_Q/\alpha_{3,s} + L_f)}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2
\end{aligned}$$

In the third inequality, we use the Cauchy-Schwartz inequality $2\langle a, b \rangle \leq \|a\|^2 + \|b\|^2$. According to the optimality of $x_{t,s}$, we have

$$v_{t,s} + \chi\theta_s A^T(Ax_{t-1,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c) + (1-\chi)\theta_s A^T(Ax_{t,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c) + A^T\lambda_{t-1,s} + \eta_s(x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}) = 0.$$

If we denote $\hat{x}_{t,s} = \chi x_{t,s} + (1-\chi)x_{t-1,s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
v_{t,s} &= \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}) - A^T(\theta_s(A\hat{x}_{t,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c) + \lambda_{t-1,s}) \\
&= \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}) - A^T(\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + \theta_s A(\hat{x}_{t,s} - x_{t,s}) + \theta_s B(y_{t-1,s} - y_{t,s}))
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\bar{L} \geq L_Q/\alpha_{3,s} + L_f$, $\mathbb{E}(v_{t,s}) = \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md})$ and $x_{t-1,s}^{ag}, x_{t,s}^{md}, \tilde{x}_{s-1}$ is independent of $v_{t,s}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{E}f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) &\leq \alpha_{1,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}), x_{t-1,s}^{ag} - x_{t,s}^{md}\rangle) + \alpha_{2,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}), x - x_{t,s}^{md}\rangle) \\
&\quad +\alpha_{3,s}(f(x_{t,s}^{md}) + \langle \nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}), \tilde{x}_{s-1} - x_{t,s}^{md}\rangle + \frac{1}{2L_Q}\|\nabla f(x_{t,s}^{md}) - v_{t,s}\|^2) + \\
&\quad \alpha_{2,s}\langle \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}), x_{t,s} - x\rangle - \langle (\theta_s(A\hat{x}_{t,s} + By_{t-1,s} - c) + \lambda_{t-1,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle + \\
&\quad \frac{\alpha_{2,s}^2\bar{L}}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 \\
&\leq \alpha_{1,s}f(x_{t-1,s}^{ag}) + \alpha_{2,s}f(x) + \alpha_{3,s}f(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) + \alpha_{2,s}\langle \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}), x_{t,s} - x\rangle - \\
&\quad \alpha_{2,s}\langle \frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + \lambda_{t-1,s} + \theta_s A(\hat{x}_{t,s} - x_{t,s}) + \theta_s B(y_{t-1,s} - y_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle \\
&\quad +\frac{\alpha_{2,s}^2\bar{L}}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 \qquad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

The second inequality is due to Lemma 1 and the convexity of $f(x)$.

According to the optimality of Line 12 in Algorithm 1 and the convexity of $g(y)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
g(y_{t,s}) - g(y) &\leq \langle \partial g(y_{t,s}), y_{t,s} - y\rangle \\
&= \langle \theta_s(Ax_{t,s} + By_{t,s} - c) + \lambda_{t-1,s}, B(y - y_{t,s})\rangle. \qquad (6)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the definition of gap function, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}Q(w; w_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s}Q(w; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{3,s}Q(w; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
= \; & [f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) + g(y_{t,s}^{ag}) + \langle \lambda, Ax_{t,s}^{ag} + By_{t,s}^{ag} - c\rangle] - [f(x) + g(y) + \langle \lambda_{t,s}^{ag}, Ax + By - c\rangle] \\
& -\alpha_{1,s}([f(x_{t-1,s}^{ag}) + g(y_{t-1,s}^{ag}) + \langle \lambda, Ax_{t-1,s}^{ag} + By_{t-1,s}^{ag} - c\rangle] - [f(x) + g(y) + \langle \lambda_{t-1,s}^{ag}, Ax + By - c\rangle]) \\
& -\alpha_{3,s}([f(\tilde{x}_{s-1}) + g(\tilde{y}_{s-1}) + \langle \lambda, A\tilde{x}_{s-1} + B\tilde{y}_{s-1} - c\rangle] - [f(x) + g(y) + \langle \tilde{\lambda}_{s-1}, Ax + By - c\rangle]) \\
= \; & [f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s}f(x_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{2,s}f(x) - \alpha_{3,s}f(\tilde{x}_{s-1})] + [g(y_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s}g(y_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{2,s}g(y) \\
& -\alpha_{3,s}g(\tilde{y}_{s-1})] + \alpha_{2,s}\langle \lambda, Ax_{s,t} + By_{s,t} - c\rangle - \alpha_{2,s}\langle \lambda_{t,s}, Ax + By - c\rangle \\
\leq \; & [f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s}f(x_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{2,s}f(x) - \alpha_{3,s}f(\tilde{x}_{s-1})] + \alpha_{2,s}[g(y_{t,s}) - g(y)] \\
& +\alpha_{2,s}\langle \lambda, Ax_{s,t} + By_{s,t} - c\rangle - \alpha_{2,s}\langle \lambda_{t,s}, Ax + By - c\rangle \qquad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

Combining (5), (6) and (7), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}\ Q(w; w_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s,t} Q(w; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{3,s,t} Q(w; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
\leq\ & \alpha_{2,s}[\langle \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}), x_{t,s} - x\rangle - \\
& \langle \frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + \lambda_{t-1,s} + \theta_s A(\hat{x}_{t,s} - x_{t,s}) + \theta_s B(y_{t-1,s} - y_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle \\
& + \frac{\alpha_{2,s}\bar{L}}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 + \langle \theta_s(Ax_{t,s} + By_{t,s} - c) + \lambda_{t-1,s}, B(y - y_{t,s})\rangle \\
& + \langle \lambda, Ax_{s,t} + By_{s,t} - c\rangle - \langle \lambda_{t,s}, Ax + By - c\rangle] \\
\leq\ & \alpha_{2,s}[\langle \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}), x_{t,s} - x\rangle - \\
& \langle \frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + \lambda_{t-1,s} + \theta_s A(\hat{x}_{t,s} - x_{t,s}) + \theta_s B(y_{t-1,s} - y_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle \\
& + \frac{\alpha_{2,s}\bar{L}}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2 + \langle \theta_s(Ax_{t,s} + By_{t,s} - c) + \lambda_{t-1,s}, B(y - y_{t,s})\rangle \\
& + \langle \lambda - \lambda_{t,s}, Ax_{s,t} + By_{s,t} - c\rangle + \langle \lambda_{t,s}, Ax_{t,s} - Ax\rangle + \langle \lambda_{t,s}, By_{t,s} - By\rangle] \\
\leq\ & \alpha_{2,s}[\langle \eta_s(x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}), x_{t,s} - x\rangle + \langle \lambda - \lambda_{t,s}, \frac{1}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s})\rangle - \\
& \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle + \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), B(y - y_{t,s})\rangle \\
& - \theta_s\langle A(\hat{x}_{t,s} - x_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle - \theta_s\langle B(y_{t-1,s} - y_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle \\
& + \frac{\alpha_{2,s}\bar{L}}{2}\|x_{t,s} - x_{t-1,s}\|_2^2
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Since $2\langle a, b\rangle = \|a + b\|^2 - \|a\|^2 - \|b\|^2$,we have

$$\langle x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}, x_{t,s} - x\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\|x_{t-1,s} - x\|^2 - \|x_{t,s} - x\|^2 - \|x_{t-1,s} - x_{t,s}\|^2) \tag{9}$$

$$\langle \lambda - \lambda_{t,s}, \lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\|\lambda_{t-1,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}\|^2). \tag{10}$$

Since $B(y - y_{t,s}) = (Ax + By - c) - \frac{1}{\rho_s}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + A(x_{t,s} - x)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle + \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), B(y - y_{t,s})\rangle \\
=\ & -(\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle + \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), (Ax + By - c)\rangle \\
& + \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), -\frac{1}{\rho_{t,s}}(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}) + A(x_{t,s} - x)\rangle \\
=\ & -\frac{\theta_s - \rho_s}{\rho_s}\|\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}\|^2 + \langle (\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s} - 1)(\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda_{t-1,s}), (Ax + By - c)
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

We also have

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\theta_s\langle A(\hat{x}_{t,s}-x_{t,s}), A(x_{t,s}-x)\rangle + \theta_s\langle B(y_{t,s}-y_{t-1,s}), A(x_{t,s}-x)\rangle \\
= \;& \frac{\chi\theta_s}{2}(\|A(x_{t-1,s}-x_{t,s})\|^2 + \|A(x_{t-1,s}-x)\|^2 - \|A(x_{t,s}-x)\|^2) \\
& +\frac{\theta_s}{2}(\|Ax_{t,s}+By_{t,s}-c\|^2 - \|Ax+By_{t,s}-c\|^2 \\
& +\|Ax+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2 - \|Ax_{t,s}+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2) \\
\leq \;& \frac{\chi\theta_s}{2}(\|A(x_{t-1,s}-x)\|^2 - \|A(x_{t,s}-x)\|^2) + \frac{\chi\theta_s\|A\|_2^2}{2}\|(x_{t-1,s}-x_{t,s})\|^2 \\
& +\frac{\theta_s}{2\rho_s^2}\|\lambda_{t,s}-\lambda_{t-1,s}\|^2 + \frac{\theta_s}{2}(\|Ax+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2 - \|Ax+By_{t,s}-c\|^2) \\
& -\frac{\theta_s}{2}\|Ax_{t,s}+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

Substituting (9), (10), (11) and (12) into (8), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}Q(w; w_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,t,s}Q(w; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{3,s,t}Q(w; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
\leq \;& \alpha_{2,s}[\frac{\eta_s}{2}(\|x_{t-1,s}-x\|^2 - \|x_{t,s}-x\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\rho_s}(\|\lambda_{t-1,s}-\lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s}-\lambda)\|^2 \\
& +\frac{\chi\theta_s}{2}(\|A(x_{t,s}-x)\|^2 - \|A(x_{t-1,s}-x)\|^2) + \frac{\theta_s}{2}(\|Ax+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2 - \\
& \|Ax+By_{t,s}-c\|^2) + \langle(\frac{\theta_s}{\rho_s}-1)(\lambda_{t,s}-\lambda_{t-1,s}), (Ax+By-c)\rangle \\
& +\frac{\rho_s-\theta_s}{2\rho_s^2}\|\lambda_{t,s}-\lambda_{t-1,s}\|^2 - \frac{\theta_s}{2}\|Ax_{t,s}+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2 \\
& -\frac{\eta_s-\bar{L}\alpha_{2,t}-\chi\theta_s\|A\|_2^2}{2}\|x_{t,s}-x_{t-1,s}\|]
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Since $Ax^*+By^*-c=0$, if we choose $\theta_s \geq \rho_s$ and $\eta_s \geq \bar{L}\alpha_{2,s}+\chi\theta_s\|A\|_2^2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& \mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{1,s}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \alpha_{3,t}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
\leq \;& \alpha_{2,t}[\frac{\eta_s}{2}(\|x_{t-1,s}-x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t,s}-x^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\rho_{t,s}}(\|\lambda_{t-1,s}-\lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s}-\lambda\|^2) \\
& +\frac{\chi\theta_{t,s}}{2}(\|A(x_{t,s}-x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{t-1,s}-x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\theta_{t,s}}{2}(\|Ax^*+By_{t-1,s}-c\|^2 - \\
& \|Ax^*+By_{t,s}-c\|^2)]
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

□

VI.2 Proof of Lemma 3

Proof. In the $s-th$ outer iteration, if we make $\theta_s = \beta_1\alpha_{2,s}$, $\rho_s = \frac{\beta_2}{\alpha_{2,s}}$,$\eta_s = (\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2)\alpha_{2,s}$ then according to Lemma 2 we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag}) - \frac{\alpha_{1,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t-1,s}^{ag}) - \frac{\alpha_{3,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
\leq\ & \frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}(\|x_{t-1,s} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{t,s} - x^*\|^2) + \frac{\beta_2}{2}(\|\lambda_{t-1,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{t,s} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+\frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}(\|A(x_{t,s} - x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{t-1,s} - x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\beta_1}{2}(\|Ax^* + By_{t-1,s} - c\|^2 - \\
&\|Ax^* + By_{t,s} - c\|^2)] \qquad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

Adding up t from 1 to m in the $s-th$ outer iteration, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,s}^{ag}) + \sum_{t=1}^{m-1}\frac{1-\alpha_{1,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag}) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{0,s}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,s}m}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
&+\frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}(\|x_{0,s} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{m,s} - x^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta_2}(\|\lambda_{0,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{m,s} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+\frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}(\|A(x_{m,s} - x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{0,s} - x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\beta_1}{2}(\|Ax^* + By_{0,s} - c\|^2 - \\
&\|Ax^* + By_{m,s} - c\|^2)] \qquad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

If $\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2} = \frac{1-\alpha_{2,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}$ and $\frac{1-\alpha_{1,s}}{\alpha_{2,s}^2} = \frac{\alpha_{3,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1-\alpha_{2,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,s}^{ag}) + \sum_{t=1}^{m-1}\frac{\alpha_{3,s+1}}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag}) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{0,s}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,s}m}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
&+\frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}(\|x_{0,s} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{m,s} - x^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta_2}(\|\lambda_{0,s} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{m,s} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+\frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}(\|A(x_{m,s} - x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{0,s} - x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\beta_1}{2}(\|Ax^* + By_{0,s} - c\|^2 - \\
&\|Ax^* + By_{m,s} - c\|^2)] \qquad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the convexity of $f(x)$ and $g(y)$ and the linearity of $\lambda(Ax + By - c)$ (w.r.t. $x\&y$), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_s) &= f(\tilde{x}_s) - f(x^*) + g(\tilde{y}_s) - g(y^*) + \langle\lambda, A\tilde{x}_s + B\tilde{y}_s - c\rangle \\
&\leq \frac{1}{m}\sum_{t=1}^{m}(f(x_{t,s}^{ag}) - f(x^*) + g(y_{t,s}^{ag}) - g(y^*) + \langle\lambda, Ax_{t,s}^{ag} + By_{t,s}^{ag} - c\rangle) \\
&= \frac{1}{m}\sum_{t=1}^{m}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{t,s}^{ag})
\end{aligned}$$

Since $x_{0,s} = x_{m,s-1}$, $y_{0,s} = y_{m,s-1}$ and $\lambda_{0,s} = \lambda_{m,s-1}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,s}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,s+1}m}{\alpha_{2,s+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_s) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,s-1}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,s}m}{\alpha_{2,s}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_{s-1}) \\
&+\frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}(\|x_{m,s-1} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{m,s} - x^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta_2}(\|\lambda_{m,s-1} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{m,s} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+\frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}(\|A(x_{m,s} - x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{m,s-1} - x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\beta_1}{2}(\|Ax^* + By_{m,s-1} - c\|^2 - \\
&\|Ax^* + By_{m,s} - c\|^2)] \qquad (18)
\end{aligned}$$

Summing s from 1 to N, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,N}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,N+1}m}{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_N) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,0}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,1}m}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_0) \\
&+\frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}(\|x_{m,0} - x^*\|^2 - \|x_{m,N} - x^*\|^2) + \frac{1}{2\beta_2}(\|\lambda_{m,0} - \lambda\|^2 - \|\lambda_{m,N} - \lambda\|^2) \\
&+\frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}(\|A(x_{m,N} - x^*)\|^2 - \|A(x_{m,0} - x^*)\|^2) + \frac{\beta_1}{2}(\|Ax^* + By_{m,0} - c\|^2 - \\
&\|Ax^* + By_{m,N} - c\|^2)] \qquad (19)
\end{aligned}$$

According to the convexity of $Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \cdot)$, if we set $\hat{w}_N = \frac{1}{1+\alpha_{3,N+1}m}w_{m,N}^{ag} + \frac{\alpha_{3,N+1}}{1+\alpha_{3,N+1}m}\tilde{w}_N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1 + \alpha_{3,N+1}m}{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}\mathbb{E}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \hat{w}_N) \\
\leq\ & \frac{1}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; w_{m,0}^{ag}) + \frac{\alpha_{3,1}m}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \tilde{w}_0) + \frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}\|x_{m,0} - x^*\|^2 \\
&+\frac{1}{2\beta_2}\|\lambda_{m,0} - \lambda\|^2 + \frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}\|A(x_{m,N} - x^*)\|^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{2}\|Ax^* + By_{m,0} - c\|^2 \qquad (20)
\end{aligned}$$

The above inequality is true for all λ, hence it also holds in the ball $\mathbb{B}_0 = \{\lambda : \|\lambda\|_2 \leq \gamma\}$, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\max_{\lambda\in\mathbb{B}_0} Q(x^*, y^*, \lambda; \hat{x}, \hat{y}, \hat{\lambda}) &= \max_{\lambda\in\mathbb{B}_0}\{f(\hat{x}) + g(\hat{y}) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \langle\lambda, A\hat{x} + B\hat{y} - c\rangle\} \\
&= f(\hat{x}) + g(\hat{y}) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \gamma\|A\hat{x} + B\hat{y} - c\|^2 \qquad (21)
\end{aligned}$$

If we make both side of inequality (20) the max of $\lambda \in \mathbb{B}_0$, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathbb{E}[f(\hat{x}_N) + g(\hat{y}_N) - f(x^*) - g(y^*) + \gamma\|A\hat{x}_N + B\hat{y}_N - c\|^2] \\
\leq\ & \frac{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}{1 + m\alpha_{3,N+1}}[\frac{1}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) + \frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}\|x_{m,0} - x^*\|^2 \\
&+\max_{\lambda\in\mathbb{B}_0}\frac{1}{2\beta_2}\|\lambda_{m,0} - \lambda\|^2 + \frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}\|A(x_{m,N} - x^*)\|^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{2}\|By^* + By_{m,0}\|^2] \\
\leq\ & \frac{\alpha_{2,N+1}^2}{1 + m\alpha_{3,N+1}}[\frac{1 + m\alpha_{3,1}}{\alpha_{2,1}^2}(f(\tilde{x}_0) + g(\tilde{y}_0) - f(x^*) - g(y^*)) + \frac{\bar{L} + \chi\beta_1\|A\|_2^2}{2}D_{x^*}^2 \\
&+\frac{1}{2\beta_2}\gamma^2 + \frac{\chi\beta_1}{2}D_{A,X}^2 + \frac{\beta_1}{2}D_{y^*,B}^2] \qquad (22)
\end{aligned}$$

, where the first inequality is due to the initialization $A\tilde{x}_0 + B\tilde{y}_0 - c = 0$ and $Ax^* + By^* - c = 0$. □